



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,453	09/28/2001	Carl Bruecken	06975-202001	1659

26171 7590 02/02/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,453

Applicant(s)

BRUECKEN, CARL

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 02 July 2004, is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 34 recites "... *the time of a request for information concerning the word is prior to the received request.*" The claim is unclear that the one ordinarily skilled in the art cannot recognize the encompassed claimed limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Zaenen et al.** ("Zaenen") (U.S. Patent 5,642,522).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, **Zaenen** teaches methods for providing a computer user with an accessible electronic dictionary system, the method comprising:

- a). *'receiving a data request action for a word appearing in an electronic document'* as a typical word processing program, the user can select a word by highlighting the word or placing a cursor on the word, and access a thesaurus or a dictionary (col. 2, lines 49-52);
- b). *'accessing information regarding context of the word derived from within the electronic document in which the word appears'* as analyzing the selected word in the context of neighboring and surrounding words to resolve ambiguities (col. 2, lines 35-43);
- c). *'accessing a definition of the word'* as an on-line reference work such as a dictionary or thesaurus (col. 2, lines 47-49; 54-57);
- d). *'storing the definition of the word'* as number of definitions of the selected word (col. 2, lines 54-57) *'along with the context information for the word'* as a set of possible contexts of the selected word and the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 8, lines 10-13 and col. 1, lines 40-41; and
- e). *'enabling access by the computer user to the definition and the context information'* as an electronic dictionary in connection with a body of electronically encoded text (col. 1, lines 8-11 and col. 2, lines 42-57).

Regarding claims 2 and 14, **Zaenen** further teaches wherein 'the context information includes at least one word that is positioned adjacent to the word within the

electronic document from which the context information was retrieved' as the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 1, lines 40-43).

Regarding claims 3 and 22, **Zaenen** further teaches 'enabling access to a definition and context information for one or more other words that are related to the word when enabling access to the definition and context information for the word' as the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 1, lines 40-43 and col. 2, lines 54-57).

Regarding claims 4 and 23, **Zaenen** further teaches 'enabling access to the definition and the context information for the word includes displaying context information from more than one electronic document in which the word has appeared' (col. 1, lines 40-43 and col. 2, lines 54-57). Although **Zaenen** does not explicitly teach that the context information is from more than one electronic document, it should be understood that since the electronic dictionary in the prior art is connected with the word processing system that is accessible to many users, the context information in the dictionary is most likely derived from electronic documents of various users.

Regarding claims 5 and 26, **Zaenen** further teaches 'determining a selectable level of detail for the definition to be retrieved' as allowing user to request a particular level of additional information. The smallest amount of additional information would be an additional sense of the same citation form and the greatest amount of additional

Art Unit: 2167

information would be all the information relating to all citation forms of the selected word (col. 9, lines 14-22).

Regarding claim 24, **Zaenen** further teaches wherein 'enabling the display of the context information includes enabling the display of at least one word that is positioned adjacent to the word within the different electronic document in which the context information was derived' as the context of neighboring and surrounding words (col. 1, lines 35-42).

Regarding claims 29 and 31, **Zaenen** further teaches wherein 'accessing includes retrieving a portion of the definition and the context information for the word from storage' as an on-line reference work such as a dictionary or thesaurus (col. 2, lines 54-57 and col. 1, lines 40-43).

Regarding claim 20, **Zaenen** teaches a method for using an electronic dictionary to retrieve information related to a word appearing in an electronic document, the method comprising:

a). 'receiving a data request action for a word appearing in an accessed electronic document' as a typical word processing program, the user can select a word by highlighting the word or placing a cursor on the word, and access a thesaurus or a dictionary (col. 2, lines 49-52);

Art Unit: 2167

b). 'accessing at least one stored definition of the word and stored context information regarding context of the word, wherein the stored context was derived from within a different electronic document in which the word also appeared and wherein the stored context was stored in response to a data request action previously generated for the word' as analyzing the selected word in the context of neighboring and surrounding words to resolve ambiguities and context determination typically entails checking whether the selected word is part of a predefined multi-word combination (col. 2, lines 35-43; col. 2, lines 42-57 and col. 1, lines 45-50). It is well-known that in a typical word processing program, the user can select a word by highlight the word. If the dictionary does not contain definition of the selected word, the user is given a chance to add the target word into the dictionary.

c). 'enabling a display of the definition and the context information' as an electronic dictionary in connection with a body of electronically encoded text (col. 1, lines 8-11 and col. 2, lines 42-57).

Regarding claim 30, **Zaenen** further teaches wherein 'retrieving includes retrieving multiple words and corresponding contexts from storage' as multi-word combination containing the selected word are found (col. 3, lines 59-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2167

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 11, 12, 15, 19, 21, 25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zaenen et al.** ("Zaenen") (U.S. Patent 5,642,522) as applied to claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 above and in view of **Nielsen** (U.S. Patent 5,970,492).

Regarding claim 11, **Zaenen** does not explicitly teach the definition and the context information for the word is stored in a manner designed to enable mobile access.

Neilsen, however, teaches the definition and the context information for the word is stored in a manner designed to enable mobile access (col. 2, lines 35-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen**'s teaching would have allowed **Zaenen's** to share a common customized dictionary based on a wide range of network such as an Internet in order to improve the accessibility to the dictionary as indicated in col. 3, lines 24-28.

Regarding claim 12, **Zaenen** does not explicitly teach wherein the definition and the context information are stored in a manner to enable future use by a computer user other than the computer user responsible for generating the data request action.

Neilsen, however, teaches the definition and the context information are stored in a manner to enable future use by a computer user other than the computer user responsible for generating the data request action (col. 2, lines 35-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen**'s teaching would have allowed **Zaenen's** to share a common customized dictionary as this would facilitate the staff to perform their work in effective an efficient manner.

Regarding claims 15 and 25, **Zaenen** does not explicitly teach wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context information for more than one word identified by a single user.

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context information for more than one word identified by a single user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen**'s teaching would have allowed **Zaenen's** to develop a personal customized dictionary for storing special words tailored to the user's profession.

Regarding claim 19, **Zaenen** does not explicitly teach wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context of information for at least one word identified by each of more than one related identity.

Art Unit: 2167

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein the electronic dictionary includes definitions and related context of information for at least one word identified by each of more than one related identity (col. 4, lines 20-42 and col. 11, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen**'s teaching would have allowed **Zaenen's** the ability to add new definitions and related context information to the customized dictionary based on the target community.

Regarding claim 21, **Zaenen** does not explicitly teach wherein the different electronic document from which the context information was derived was previously viewed by a party submitting the data request action.

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein the different electronic document from which the context information was derived was previously viewed by a party submitting the data request action (col. 6, lines 37-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen**'s teaching would have allowed **Zaenen's** to ascertain the relevancy of the context information prior to submitting the data request action.

Regarding claim 32, **Zaenen** does not explicitly teach wherein accessing the context information includes accessing the context information from a device that is distinct from a device generating the data request action.

Neilsen, however, teaches wherein *'accessing the context information includes accessing the context information from a device that is distinct from a device generating the data request action'* as accessing the context information from the vendor computers and generating the data request action from the client computers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Neilsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenen's** to limit access to the context information to only authorized individuals.

8. Claims 6-10, 16-18, and 27-28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zaenen et al.** ("Zaenen") (U.S. Patent 5,642,522) as applied to claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 above and in view of **Craddock et al.** ("Craddock") (U.S. Patent 6,351,771 B1) and **Nielsen** (U.S. Patent 5,970,492)

Regarding claims 6, 7, and 27, **Zaenene** does not explicitly teach the steps:

- a). identifying a target community appropriate for the computer user inputting the data request action; and
- b). selecting the definition to be stored for the word from among more than one available definition based on the target community identified.

a). **Craddock**, however, teaches *'identifying a target community appropriate for the computer user inputting the data request action'* as IP address and/or user ID (col. 5, lines 11-15).

Art Unit: 2167

b). **Zaenene and Craddock** do not explicitly teach step selecting the definition to be stored for the word from among more than one available definition based on the target community identified.

Nielsen, however, teaches 'selecting the definition to be stored for the word from among more than one available definition' as requested by users for addition to the database of approved words (col. 4, lines 20-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Nielsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenene and Craddock**'s to direct their requests store the definitions to the appropriate community.

Regarding claims 8 and 17, **Zaenene and Craddock** do not clearly teach determining the identification information based on an Internet Protocol address of the computer user.

Neilsen, however, teaches determining the identification information based on an Internet Protocol address of the computer user (col. 5, lines 11-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Nielsen** 's teaching would have allowed **Zaenene and Craddock**'s to find out user's identity in order to develop the user profile based on individuals characteristics and preferences.

Art Unit: 2167

Regarding claims 9, 16, and 18, **Zaenene and Neilsen** do not clearly teach determining the identification information based on a screen name of the computer user.

Craddock, however, teaches '*determining the identification information based on a screen name of the computer user*' as a user ID (col. 5, lines 11-13).

Regarding claim 10, **Zaenene and Neilsen** do not clearly determining the identification information based on a user profile of the computer user.

Craddock, however, teaches '*determining the identification information based on a user profile of the computer user*' as a record which contains user subscribes services, user preferences for various possible client devices employed by that user and any other preferences of the user as well as billing information for the user (col. 5, lines 24-32).

Regarding claim 28, **Zaenene** further teaches wherein 'selecting among the definitions includes selecting based on a relationship between the target community identified and the context information' (col. 3, line 42 – col. 4, line 8).

9. Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zaenen et al.** ("Zaenen") (U.S. Patent 5,642,522) as applied to claims 1-5, 13, 14, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 above and in view of **Ferin** (US 20030004707A1).

Regarding claim 33, **Zaenen** teaches a method for using an electronic dictionary to retrieve information related to a word appearing in an electronic document, the method comprising:

receiving a request for information concerning a word appearing in an accessed electronic document (col. 2, lines 48-52);

'accessing a definition for the word from an electronic dictionary' as an on-line reference work such as a dictionary or thesaurus (col. 2, lines 52-57); and

'accessing context information for the word based on content from within other electronic documents within which the word appeared at a time of a request for information concerning the word' as an electronic dictionary in connection with a body of electronically encoded text (col. 1, lines 45-50; col. 2, lines 42-57).

Zaenen does not explicitly teach dynamically update.

Ferin, however, teaches 'dynamically update' as enable personal information to be acquired in a context-sensitive manner by dynamically modified based on the given context ([¶] 0049).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Ferin's** teaching would have allowed **Zaenen's** to personalize the data that are displayed to the user to obtain particular information by dynamically modified based on the given context in which the file is generated as suggested by **Ferin** at [¶s 0049 and 0052].

Regarding claim 34, **Zaenen** further teaches wherein the time of a request for information concerning the word is prior to the received request (col. 3, lines 42-57).

Regarding claim 35, **Zaenen** further teaches wherein the other electronic documents within which the word appeared are documents other than dictionaries (col. 2, lines 48-52).

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed 02 July 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Zaenen does not disclose "storing the definition of the word along with context information for the word" as recited by claim 1.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Zaenen teaches *storing the definition of the word along with context information for the word* as the user has access to an on-line reference work such as a dictionary or thesaurus. In the case of a thesaurus, the user is presented with a number of synonyms of the selected word. In the case of a dictionary the user is presented with whatever information the dictionary contains for the selected word, normally a number of definitions of the selected words (col. 2, lines 47-57). Further, Zaenen teaches the dictionary preferably has information about multi-word combinations that include the selected word, and the context determination typically entails checking whether the

selected word is part of a predefined multi-word combination. The dictionary information for a given word also preferably includes pointers to all multi-word combinations containing the word (col. 1, lines 45-50; col. 8, lines 44-46). Hence, Zaenen teaches the limitation as claimed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Application/Control Number: 09/964,453
Art Unit: 2167

Page 17



Leslie Wong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2167

LW
January 28, 2005


Primary Examiner